

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2 and 5-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10 and 16-19 are independent. All of the pending claims stand rejected. By this amendment, independent claims 1, 10 and 16-19 are amended. New claims 20-22 are added. No new matter has been amended by this amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph four (4) of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,157,706 to Rachelson (“Rachelson”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0075524 to Blair et al. (“Blair”). In paragraph six (6) of the Office Action, claims 5, 12, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rachelson in view of Blair, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,456 to Shimoosawa (“Shimoosawa”). In paragraph seven (7) of the Office Action, claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rachelson in view of Blair, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,783 to Blossman et al. (“Blossman”). In paragraph eight (8) of the Office Action, claims 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rachelson in view of Blair, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,883,016 to Fuji et al. (“Fuji”).

In the *Response to Arguments* section, the Office Action indicates, *inter alia*, that “during the outgoing email steps, the TIF image based on the fax coming out of the FAX server 200 goes

to unit 204 where the mail processing agent generates email message based on the TIF image attachment which is later on sent out using the SMTP server (Figure 2; column 11, lines 21-37) so therefore the attachment is based on color and/or monochrome TIF image from the fax device shown in Figure 2.”

First of all, Applicants note that the e-mail message in Rachelson does not have an attachment generated based on the received facsimile data (e.g., image data) as required by the present invention. The cited portion by the Office Action (i.e., col. 11, lines 21-37) merely indicates that “[t]he described embodiment of the present invention converts received fax messages to a graphics file before sending it as e-mail. In step 1216, the outgoing e-mail is converted to a graphical format preferred by the recipient (as indicated by the recipient database).” (Emphasis added) Another portion of Rachelson also reveals that the received fax message needs to be converted to an e-mail message and sent out. See, e.g., col. 11, lines 5-7 of Rachelson. In other words, the generated e-mail message in Rachelson appears to be converted directly from the fax message.

In contrast, the e-mail message generated by present invention, as featured in independent claims 1, 10 and 16-19, has an attachment generated based on the received facsimile data which has the color and/or monochrome image. Claims of the present invention further recites that the attachment in the e-mail message is generated also based on the customized format for the client.

As Applicants understand it, none of other cited references (i.e., Blair, Shimoosawa, Blossman and Fuji) teaches this aspect of the present invention as discussed above.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 10 and 16-19 is believed neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references (i.e., Rachelson, Blair, Shimoosawa, Blossman and Fuji), either taken alone or in combination, for at least the reasons discussed above.

Nonetheless, independent claims 1, 10 and 16-19 have been amended for further clarification. In particular, amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “generating means for generating an electronic mail directed to the client’s account where the electronic mail has an attachment generated based on the received facsimile data having the color image information and/or monochrome image information received by said reception means, and also based on the customized format of an image for the client received by said registration means.” Other amended independent claims 10 and 16-19 have similar features to amended claim 1 as described herein.

Applicants believe that amended claims 1, 10 and 16-19 further distinguish over the cited references.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 10 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims. Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as to why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed *supra*, the dependent claims are also believed allowable. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

New claims 20-22 have been added to recite the invention in an alternative manner.

Specifically, each of new claims 20-22 depends from claims 1, 16 and 18, respectively, and is accordingly believed patentable for at least the similar reasons to claims 1, 16 and 18 discussed above.

Applicants believe that the application as amended including the new claims is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

AUTHORIZATION


A petition for a two-month extension of time along with the associated fee is enclosed, extending the date for responding until November 5, 2007. Should an additional extension of time be required to render this paper timely filed, such extension is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees necessitated by this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 13-4500 (Order No. 1232-4792). A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED.

An early and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: November 5, 2007

By:


Sungho Hong
Registration No. 54,571

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 (Telephone)
(212) 415-8701 (Facsimile)

AUTHORIZATION


A petition for a two-month extension of time along with the associated fee is enclosed, extending the date for responding until November 5, 2007. Should an additional extension of time be required to render this paper timely filed, such extension is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees necessitated by this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 13-4500 (Order No. 1232-4792). A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED.

An early and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: November 5, 2007

By:



Sungho Hong
Registration No. 54,571

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 (Telephone)
(212) 415-8701 (Facsimile)